

No. 9(1)-81-8Lab/2130-3154.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Paul Metal Industries, Jagadhri :—

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 98 of 1980

between

SHRI INDRAJ MIA, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PAUL METAL INDUSTRIES, JAGADHRI

Present.—

No one for the workman.

Shri Subhash Chander for the management.

AWARD

This reference has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor,—vide his order No. ID/YMN/82-80/22926, dated 5th May, 1980 under section 10(i)(c) of the I.D. Act for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Indraj Mia, workman and the management of M/s Paul Metal Industries, Jagadhri. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Indraj Mia was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled.

On the receipt of the order of reference notices, as usual were sent to the parties who appeared in response to the same on 24th July, 1980. The workman did not file his statement of claim and prayed that his demand notice be treated as his statement of claim. The management filed their written statement on 29th October, 1980 and the case was fixed for filing of the rejoinder by the workman. The workman obtained two-three adjournments for the same and on 19th February, 1981 neither the workman nor his authorised representative was present. The management in their written statement denied the factum that the workman was ever engaged by them. The workman did not come forward to refute the allegation of the management.

Under these circumstances I consider it reasonable and just to believe the version of the management when the workman did not care to pursue his demand raised on the management. I am further inclined to presume that there is no dispute between the workman and the management. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Dated the 21st February, 1981.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 360, dated 23rd February, 1981

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the I.D. Act.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 9(1)81-8Lab/2131-3154.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Paul Metal Industries, Jagadhri :—

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK.

Reference No. 91 of 1980

between

SHRI SHANKAR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT M/S PAUL METAL INDUSTRIES, JAGADHRI

Present :

No one for the Workman.

Shri Subash Chander, for the management.

## AWARD

This reference has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor,—*vide* his order No. ID/YMN/78-80/22974, dated 5th May, 1980 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Shankar, workman and the management of M/s Paul Metal Industries, Jagadhri. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Shankar was justified and in order ?  
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On the receipt of the order of reference notices as usual were sent to the parties who appeared in response to the same on 24th July, 1980. The workman did not file his statement of claim and prayed that his demand notice be treated as his statement of claim. The management filed their written statement on 29th October, 1980 and the case was fixed for filing of rejoinder by the workman. The workman obtained two-three adjournment for the same and on 19th February, 1981 neither the workman nor his authorised representative was present. The management in their written statement denied the factum that the workman was ever engaged by them. The workman did not come forward to refute the allegation of the management.

Under these circumstances I consider it reasonable and just to believe the version of the management when the workman did not care to pursue his demand raised on management. I am further inclined to presume that there is no dispute between the workman and the management. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Dated 21st February, 1981.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 359, dated 23rd February, 1981.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act,

BANWARI LAL DALAL,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 9(1)-81-8Lab/2132-3154.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Paul Metal Industries, Jagadhri :—

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
HARYANA, ROHTAK.

Reference No. 97 of 1980

*between*

SHRI JAI KISHORE, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PAUL METAL  
INDUSTRIES, JAGADHRI

*Present.—*

No one for the workman

Shri Subhash Chander, for the management.

## AWARD

This reference has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor,—*vide* his order No. ID/YMN/81-80/22938, dated 5th May, 1980, under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Jai Kishore, workman and the management of M/s Paul Metal Industries, Jagadhri. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Jai Kishore was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?



On the receipt of the order of reference notices as usual were sent to the parties who appeared in response to the same on 24th July, 1980. The workman did not file his statement of claim. The management filed their written statement on 29th October, 1980 and the case was fixed for filing of the rejoinder by the workman. The workman obtained two-three adjournments for the same and on 19th February, 1981 neither the workman nor his authorised representative was present. The management in their written statement denied the factum that the workman was ever engaged by them. The workman did not come forward to refute the allegation of the management.

Under these circumstances I consider it reasonable and just to believe the version of the management when the workman did not care to pursue his demand raised on the management. I am further inclined to presume that there is no dispute between the workman and the management. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

Dated the 21st February, 1981.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 358, dated the 23rd February, 1981.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, of Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Rohtak.

H. L. GUGNANI, Commissioner & Secy.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT  
BUILDINGS AND ROADS BRANCH  
HISSAR CIRCLE

The 12th March, 1981

No. 28/HA/63-SI/1062.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is likely to be required to be taken by Government, of Haryana at public expense, for a public purpose, namely, constructing Sirsa Ottu road to Dhani Bilas Pur road in Sirsa District, it is hereby notified that the land in the locality described below is likely to be required for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provision of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to authorise the officers, for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen, to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested who has any objection to the acquisition of any land in the locality may within 30 days of the publication of this notification, file an objection in writing before the Land Acquisition Collector, Haryana, P.W.D., B. & R. Branch, Ambala Cantt.

SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Locality	Area in acres	Remarks
Sirsa	Sirsa	Ram Nagar	26	
			12, 19/2, 20, 21, 22	
			29	
			1/1, 1/2, 2, 9, 10	
			126, 175, 252, 115, 55	

(Sd) . . . . .  
Superintending Engineer,  
Hissar Circle, P.W.D., B. & R. Branch,  
Hissar.